

Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail Advisory Council Summary of April 29, 2015 Meeting

The Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail (“The Trail”) Advisory Council convened a meeting at 10:00 A.M. on April 29, 2015 at Murphy Hall in Westmoreland State Park, Montross, VA. In accordance with the provisions of Public Law 92-463, the meeting was open to the public.

Council members present:

- Wayne Adkins
- Shelly Baird
- Suzanne Baird
- Virginia Busby
- Trish Carothers
- Joel Dunn
- Elizabeth Hughes
- Mary Ann Lisanti
- Drew McMullen
- Richard Pearsall
- Mark Platts
- John Reynolds, Chair
- Kristin Saunders
- Mervin Savoy
- Charlie Stek

Nominees to the Council present:

- Clyde Cristman, Virginia Dept of Conservation and Recreation
- Julie Langan, Virginia Dept of Historic Resources

Others present representing absent Advisory Council members:

- Lauren Imgrund, Pennsylvania Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

National Park Service staff present for all, or portions of the meeting were:

- Deanna Beacham
- Bob Campbell
- Suzanne Copping
- Jonathan Doherty
- Jackie Kramer
- Chuck Hunt
- Christine Lucero
- Abbi Wicklein-Bayne

Members of the general public present for a portion of the meeting were:

- Glenn Markwith, Virginia Watermen’s Heritage Tour Program Coordinator

Welcome and Introductions / Setting the Stage

Superintendent Chuck Hunt welcomed the Advisory Council members to the meeting. Clyde Cristman, Director of VA DCR welcomed the council to Westmoreland State Park. Members and staff introduced themselves. Chair John Reynolds reviewed the agenda and objectives for the meeting.

The council was provided with a brief synopsis of a recent trip NPS and Chesapeake Conservancy staff took to San Francisco to explore and learn about the potential of strong, like-minded partners coming together to provide a stable foundation for joint management of the multiple cultural and historic resources of Golden Gate NRA. Golden Gate NRA and the Golden Gate Conservancy are an innovative and model partnership for the Chesapeake. Their staffs were frank and forthcoming about the growth of their partnership from start-up to what now provides a seamless visitor experience, with a multi-million dollar revenue stream.

Part Unit Status

John Reynolds used the trail's many planning documents to illustrate to the council how far the trail has come since its inception in 2006. He discussed the trail's success and our progress in areas of interpretation, education, land conservation and our trend-setting documentation of Indigenous Cultural Landscapes, a concept first identified in the trail's Comprehensive Management Plan. All this planning has led the trail to potentially becoming a unit of the NPS system.

Typically trails are not units, with the exception of Potomac Heritage NST, Natchez Trace NST, and Appalachian NST.

John described what defines a unit. For trails, the trail must own and manage land, or own land that a partner manages for the trail. Unit status allows for permanent base funding from year-to-year through the NPS budget. Being a unit is also of perceptual value in Congress and within NPS.

Members discussed several possibilities for land ownership and/or cooperative management worth further exploration:

- Garrett Island, a USFWS property. There are active negotiations for the trail to acquire Garrett Island. Joel Dunn mentioned the Game Range Act, which prohibits the transfer of land between agencies. This Act is the hold-up on Garrett Island.
- Fort Monroe, jointly owned and managed by NPS and the Fort Monroe Authority, a (VA) state agency. If additional land became available at FOMR, is there a process to allow for CAJO management/ownership?
- Belle Haven, a Maryland DNR-owned property, currently managed by NPS (National Capital Region). NPS/NCR no longer wants to manage the property, can land and/or management of the land be transferred to the trail?

Prioritizing Trail-Related Resource Documentation

Jonathan Doherty introduced the topic with a reference to the trail's conservation strategy, which took the policy of the CMP and translated it into conservation priorities. Now, NPS and other organizations are

using the strategy document to drive how land is conserved. The increase in the watershed of major infrastructure projects, many associated with utilities, raises the importance of documenting and managing trail-related resources.

Suzanne Copping presented a PowerPoint describing trail-related resources and the trail corridor, referencing a 12-page briefing paper received as part of their meeting materials (*document and presentation attached to this meeting summary in the Administrative Record*).

Discussion about the issues surrounding identifying, mapping and evaluating the significance of cultural resources included:

- Defining the trail corridor/boundary and how it fluctuates with seasons and passage of time with tree cover and other natural changes in the landscape.
- The viewshed from the trail as a defining feature of the trail corridor boundary – is it a 360 degree view from the water (shoreline to shoreline), or different? Height from the water affects the viewshed – for example, are you in a paddlecraft or a motor boat (or a shallop)?
- Evocative landscapes -- a subset of the viewshed from the water evocative of the early 17th century time period – some may be protected, some not. These landscapes may be quite large depending upon the topography, and may include landscapes beyond shoreline development.
- 17th century archeological sites, known or surveyed, and eligible for the National Register. The extent of archeological evidence from this period is unknown, and is likely much greater than what is surveyed and mapped.
- Sites and landscapes that have significance to American Indians in the region. What are the sites of contemporary significance that we don't want to map in order to protect their identity?
- Also discussed were Smith voyage stops and Smith cross sites -- even though these need substantiation, they are still a trail resource; historic American Indian town sites are another Smith-mapped resource that lacks geo-spatial accuracy.

There was a brief discussion on a recent meeting of trail staff with staff from the National Register (NR) program.

- NR staff see tremendous value in working with state SHPOs and others to articulate the trail corridor and resources in the context of a Multiple Property Documentation Form.
- NR status of the trail would offer opportunities to link resources together thematically and across jurisdictions.
- How does the use of evocative landscapes and other mapping tools help with the nomination and Section 106 process?
- What qualities does a property need to possess to qualify for the NR? Aerial photography is not the best or only way to assess resources and their condition, but may be a primary source of data for some permitting agencies to survey resource condition and the effects of potential impacts.

Suggestions from the membership for successful nomination of the trail to the National Register:

- Hire an outside consultant to work through the process.
- Don't rely solely on Section 106 information; use the NEPA process as well.
- Allow for the use of mitigation; have areas and/or projects in mind to suggest.
- Members agreed that having clearly articulated and agreed-upon definitions of trail-related resources was critical to the success of the NR nomination.

Abbi Wicklein-Bayne and Christine Lucero lead a short discussion on Trail Site Locations and Investment (Members were provided with a chart in their pre-meeting materials. *Chart file attached to this meeting summary in the Administrative Record.*)

The discussion included:

- Where is the American Indian training and or programming and interpretation included in a hierarchy of trail places?
- What are the levels of investment (and expectation) for a site, i.e., how can a site move up the hierarchy from a purple site (visitor contact) to pink (education and interpretation) center?
- Waterproof trail maps and guides would be a useful public information tool.
- "Pink" sites could include series of hubs, a beginning point for a longer visit/experience on the trail.

Lunch

Future Course for the Trail: Map Exercise

Christine introduced the map exercise and broke membership into groups. Each group was given three identical trail maps. The group used the maps to provide their vision for the trail for the next 5, 10 and 20 years. Groups were given approximately 20 minutes to map out their vision before presenting their vision to the others. Salient points included:

- Commonalities when identifying where hubs should be: Lower Susquehanna, Hampton Roads (James/York Rivers), Eastern Shore, lower Potomac, Rappahannock, DC /Baltimore metro area.
- Recommend a spectacular event every few years to keep the trail relevant.
- Think about flow and movement of people and taking advantage of existing resources -- moving people through the landscape.
- Marketing the trail -- how to get the greatest number of people to the area where they will get the richest trail experience along with other visitor amenities. Infrastructure needs to be available for the greatest number of people to experience the trail in every way possible (museums, water, history, parks, amenities, etc.)

- Development of itineraries; an online travel planning site.

Public Comment

Glenn Mark from Virginia Heritage Watermen's tours registered to comment but was unable to stay until the public comment period. He did speak with trail staff to introduce himself and to create awareness about his tour program.

Status of the Council / Next Steps

Christine addressed membership about the status of the Council. The trail Charter is active, but current membership expires July 9, 2015. With the continued delay of the White House Liaison Office during the background check process, it is unlikely the council will be able to meet until such time as the re-appointments and new appointments can be made by the Secretary.

Meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.